

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 29, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1 and 3 are amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

#### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-2 and 4-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,590) in view of Kalvaitis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,791,530).

#### Claims 1-2 and 4-10

Claim 1 has been amended to better describe the subject matter recited in the claim. Applicant believes claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references since even if combined, the combination would not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, “a magnetic flux barrier at least partially positioned near the conductive path to minimize magnetic interaction with the conductive path as current travels through the switch stack.” Applicant notes that neither reference includes or suggest such subject matter. The Office Action states that Kalvaitis includes flux barriers 40, 42. However, Kalvaitis describes barriers 40, 42 as insulating barriers formed of fiberglass. (Col. 5, lines 4-10). Applicant notes that dielectric materials such as fiberglass have a relative magnetic permeability of 1 (about the same as air), making them ineffective at shunting magnetic fields away or providing a magnetic shield. Thus neither reference either alone or in combination, include a “magnetic flux barrier,” to “minimize magnetic interaction with the conductive path,” as claimed.

Claims 2 and 4-10 include each limitation of their parent claim and are therefore not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons given above. Moreover, applicant traverses the rejection of claim 4. Applicant cannot find in either reference a flux barrier that “isolates each of conductive paths from magnetic interaction with the other conductive paths.” Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

#### Claims 11-16

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 11. Applicant believes claim 11 is not obvious in view of the cited references since, even if combined, the combination would not include each

limitation recited in the claim. For instance, “minimizing magnetic interaction with a conductive path in the transfer switch as current travels through the transfer switch.” Again, as discussed above, Applicant notes that the insulating, fiberglass barriers of Kalvaitis do not minimize magnetic interaction.

Claims 12 - 16 include each limitation of their parent claim and are therefore not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons given above. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-20

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 17. Applicant believes claim 17 is not obvious in view of the cited references since, even if combined, the combination would not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, neither reference includes “means for reducing magnetic interaction with the conductive path in the transfer switch.” Again, as discussed above, the insulating, fiberglass barriers of Kalvaitis do not reduce magnetic interaction.

Claims 18 - 20 include each limitation of their parent claim and are therefore not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons given above. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claim 3 as an independent claim including all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 359-3267 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,

LOREN L. RADEMACHER

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 359-3267

Date 1/29/04

By Peter C. Maki  
Peter C. Maki  
Reg. No. 42,832

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2004.

Patricia A. Hlton Patricia A. Hlton

Name

Signature